

REMARKS

I. Compact Disc Submission:

The Examiner objected to applicants' inclusion of a hard copy computer listing. Applicants are hereby canceling reference to the hard copy listing on the first page of the specification. The Examiner also requested submission of a computer program listing on a compact disc (CD) and reference of that listing in the specification. However, applicants did submit the computer program listing on CD when the application was filed. The specification also contains reference to the CD listing. Applicants believe the originally filed CD listing complies with 37 CFR 1.77 and 1.96. If the Examiner believes this is not the case, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide more detail explaining what is lacking in the specification.

II. Objection to Claim 20:

Applicant has amended claim 20 to replace "say" with "said."

III. Rejections under 35 USC §103:

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 15 as being obvious over Mumford (5,321,807) in view of Orton (5,465,362). The Examiner believed it would be obvious to incorporate the step of updating the visible area of each view taught by Orton into the graphics display method taught by Mumford for controlling the visible region of the window "because it is generally the task of the view system to keep track of the location and size of the view and the view areas which could be drawn and redrawn quickly and effectively as views and windows are moved."


However, claim 15 recites "filling said first and second window positions with a magnified portion of said image." Even assuming for the sake of argument that Mumford and Orton teach restoring only the portion of the window most recently uncovered, nothing in those

references teaches filling the uncovered portion of the window with a magnified portion of the image. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 15.

The Examiner also rejected claim 20 based upon Orton in view of Branson (5,740,801). Applicants submit that there is no suggestion to combine magnifying aspects of Orton with the optimization aspects of Branson. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Date: 2 JAN 04

Respectfully submitted,



Lance A. Foster, Reg. No. 38,882
Jones, Walker, Waechter, Poitevent,
Carrère & Denègre, L.L.P.
4th Floor, Four United Plaza
8555 United Plaza Boulevard
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Telephone: (225) 248-2106
Facsimile: (225) 248-3006

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop FEE RESPONSE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 2nd day of January, 2004.

